



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,580	03/20/2006	Koujiro Tanaka	286785US6PCT	2855
22850	7590	03/28/2011	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			SHIBRUE, HELEN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2484			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/28/2011	ELECTRONIC			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/572,580	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TANAKA, KOUIROU
	<b>Examiner</b> HELEN SHIBRU	<b>Art Unit</b> 2484

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED 01 March 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
 See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/HELEN SHIBRU/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 2484

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant states, "Rebaud does not disclose or suggest a display of media content decided not to be available."

In response the Examiner would like to direct Applicant's attention to the claimed invention. The claims recite display of title information of the contents but not displaying of the content. Displaying title information of the contents and displaying contents are two separate functions. In the event Applicant decides to pursue such limitation, Applicant's attention is directed to at least the claimed invention, if the reproduction permission/inhibition section decides the contents to be un reproducible, the contents are un-reproducible/un-displayable. According to the present invention title information of the unreplicable contents is displayed not the contents themselves.

In addition Rebaud teaches delivering digital media to only those media rendering client devices that have been approved (see abstract). Rebaud further teaches device IDs contains an identification of media rendering client devices (see paragraph 0021).

Applicant concluded that the Office Action has not provided an evidentiary record sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the Office Action did not apply Rebaud for a display of title information of media content which has been decided to be non-reproducible and the Office Action didn't apply Yamamoto for a decision whether the playback content is playable.

Applicant's attention is once again directed to the Office Action which indicates the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C §103, not 35 U.S.C §102. It appears that Applicants' argument is established on anticipation (35 U.S.C § 102 rejection). All the limitations in the claims are addressed and rejected in view of the prior arts. Applicant cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

As stated on the final Office Action the combination of the two prior arts teaches the limitation "a display of the title information of one of the contents which has been decided, based on the source ID applied to the one of the contents and said first source ID list, to be non-reproducible ... can be distinguished from a display of the title information of the one of the contents if the one of the contents has been decided to be reproducible," as claimed in amended claim 1. Rebaud teaches determining whether media content is reproducible or not based on a source ID applied to the content and the said first source ID and displaying reproducible content, Yamamoto teaches displaying both playable content and non playable content in such a manner to distinguish both on the display screen by providing a normal and grayed out button respectively.

Applicant traverses the taking of Official Notice but the traversal is inadequate because the Examiner already provided supporting documentary evidences. The supporting documents are provided to support the Taken of Official Notice, and deleting contents in the recording reproducing art is notoriously well known.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

See also the Final Office Action for further detail.